

Today China is one of the largest opportunities for Boeing. Some have estimated the commercial aircraft market could be as large as \$280 billion.

When we look at these issues, we look at the cooperation and the economic opportunity that has existed for our State. Microsoft is another example. It first opened an office in Beijing in 1992. It is no surprise, when President Hu was visiting the United States, he actually came to Everett and Seattle and Redmond and had an opportunity to be hosted by Bill Gates. Microsoft is benefiting greatly from the sales of computers and legally licensed software in China.

More recently, Starbucks has launched hundreds of stores in China. Who would have thought that a coffee company would go into a tea-drinking country and have so much success. But China represents roughly 20 percent of the new international store growth for Starbucks. It has become Starbucks' most important foreign market.

My point in saying this is that I hope, as we have a debate about currency—and I think it is important that we have a debate about currency—that we also realize that China is a market. It is a market for U.S. products. No export sector could be of greater interest, I believe, than the opportunity in the energy and environmental areas.

Today, China accounts for about 40 percent of the increase in world oil demand. The number of passenger vehicles on China's roads has tripled since 2001 and may equal the United States by 2030. The Chinese face this mass internal transformation from growth and modernization. We have the opportunity to help them with that transition. They are trying to keep pace. In fact, China is adding one huge 1,000-megawatt, coal-fired plant to its grid each week. That is like adding enough capacity every year to serve the entire country of Spain. But even with this new capacity, their country is without predictable electricity.

In 2004, China had power shortages in 24 of its 31 provinces and autonomous regions, so they are dealing with a challenge to deliver energy to various parts of their country.

What is the opportunity? The International Energy Agency estimated that China will spend \$2.3 trillion over the next 25 years just to meet its growing energy demands, and that modernizing its electricity grid will require about \$35 billion annually for the foreseeable future. That is where American technology can come in; that is where we can seek new opportunities for U.S. companies. In fact, the same International Energy Agency has talked about the fact that, if we institute demand-side management programs where we can leverage modernizing the electricity grid, we can show that investments of \$700 billion in the demand side could avoid almost \$1.5 trillion in additional generation, transmission, and distribution costs in China between now and 2030.

That is an interesting number. By the United States partnering with China, we would have an opportunity to help them save on their energy costs. What does that mean for us as far as the great opportunity? It means increasing exports of U.S. goods and services. It means U.S. opportunities to grow in the areas that I have mentioned. Good opportunities already exist in aerospace and software and coffee but they also can emerge in the energy and environmental sectors.

It is interesting to think that China realizes that they have a challenge and that they are trying to diversify into an array of more clean energy sources, including wind, solar, biofuels, and clean coal. They are trying to increase productivity and cost savings associated with modernizing the electricity grid.

I happened to visit Beijing last November with a group of Washington State business leaders that were there to promote long-term opportunities for us to work together. It was then that I realized how much the Chinese Government had embraced and was committed to its goal of cutting energy consumption per unit of GDP by 20 percent by 2010. For that very short period of time they have tremendous energy goals that we, the United States, can help them meet.

Modernizing the domestic energy infrastructure will require an estimated \$35 billion a year. Again, that is an opportunity for the United States, exporting existing U.S. products and services, that could help us turn around the trade imbalance.

In a speech last month, Premier Wen acknowledged that China must focus on energy conservation and emission reduction in order to both develop the economy and protect the environment. I think this is an opportunity that is before us now as we are part of the Strategic Economic Dialogue with China. Increased U.S.-China cooperation on energy and environment would have tremendous economic, environmental, and security benefits for both our nations. It would help make U.S. companies better positioned for economic opportunities both inside and outside China as we develop standards associated with our energy policy.

I recently sent a bipartisan letter to the President asking for a comprehensive U.S.-China energy policy and bilateral energy summit. I am proud to say that the bipartisan letter, signed by several of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—Senator SMITH, Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator VOINOVICH—also was signed by the four chairs of important committees—the Energy Committee, Finance Committee, Foreign Relations, and Homeland Security Committee—because I believe that they agree that this is an important opportunity for the U.S. and China to work together. In fact, we said, in sending the letter to the President:

The way we approach global energy issues will affect the international economy and

the world's environment for decades to come. A bilateral U.S.-China energy policy and a summit between our nations to focus on ways to cooperate on energy issues would have tremendous economic benefits for both our nations.

I hope as the Strategic Economic Dialogue goes forward this week that a great deal of focus will be placed on energy. When one of my predecessors, Warren Magnuson, went to China, he said, "pretending 700 million people in the world do not exist is the wrong approach." Today it is 1.3 billion people. It is time to understand China's internal transformation, our own global energy needs, and our nations' evolving relationship. It is time to see the great promise in our common interests and time to work together on shared challenges and opportunities involving energy and the environment.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who seeks time? The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I would like to speak for 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. WHITEHOUSE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1451 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CASEY. I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for up to 10 minutes in morning business and that the Senate recess at 12:40 p.m. today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his courtesy in allowing me this time.

Madam President, I rise today to focus the attention of the Congress, and the attention of the country, upon an issue that is at the heart of why I asked the people of Pennsylvania to allow me to serve in the U.S. Senate.

That issue is the well-being of our children and their future.

When we greet one another in this country we typically say "Hello" and "How are you?" But the standard greeting of the East African Masai people is not, "How are you?" but, rather, "How are the children?" This culture embodies the wisdom that the health of any civilization is always a reflection of the well-being of its most vulnerable citizens—its children.

I am distressed and alarmed that in response to the question, "How are the children," the answer today, here in the richest country on Earth, is this: The children, and particularly children from low income and working families, are not well. Our children are not

faring well because 6 years of this administration's budget cuts have decimated vital services for children and working families—cuts to childcare assistance, Head Start and other early childhood programs that help children get off to a good start.

I am determined to reverse the course this administration has taken in slashing funding for critical children's programs and I know that a great many of my colleagues—on both sides of the aisle—are equally determined. Some of the Presidential candidates have begun talking about the importance of early education and I am heartened by the increased public attention this will garner. If we don't invest money to give children—and particularly the most disadvantaged and at risk children—the services and programs they need in early childhood, they will be at much greater risk of academic failure, drug abuse and even criminal activity when they are older. We can spend upwards of \$40,000 on incarceration, thousands of dollars on drug treatment and special education, or we can spend a small fraction of that now on high quality preschool and give children the good start they deserve. We can pay now or we can pay later. The choice is ours.

On Friday, May 11, I introduced a bill, the Prepare All Kids Act of 2007." The primary goal of my bill is to help States provide high quality prekindergarten programs that will prepare children, and particularly disadvantaged children, for a successful transition to kindergarten and elementary school. My bill reflects the wisdom that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

Most States have either begun or are on the way to developing prekindergarten programs. In my own State, the new Pennsylvania Pre-K Counts initiative will provide approximately 11,000 3- and 4-year-olds with voluntary, high-quality prekindergarten that is targeted to reach children most at risk of academic failure. But States need our financial assistance. My Prepare All Kids Act provides this assistance—with conditions and matching commitments from States. Grounded in research and best practices, my bill provides a blend of State flexibility and high quality standards that will serve children well.

Here is a quick summary of the main components of my bill and why they are important for children and families:

The Prepare All Kids Act will assist States in providing at least 1 year of high quality prekindergarten to children. Studies show high quality prekindergarten programs provide enormous benefits that continue into adulthood.

Prekindergarten will be free for low-income children who need it the most. The cost of prekindergarten can be financially draining and even prohibitive for low-income and working families.

Prekindergarten programs will utilize a research-based curriculum that

supports children's cognitive, social, emotional and physical development and individual learning styles. Experts tell us that at the preschool stage, social and emotional learning can be as important, perhaps even more important, than cognitive learning. This is where early socialization takes place—learning to share, pay attention, work independently, express feelings—all these are critical to successful childhood development.

Classrooms will have a maximum of 20 children and children-to-teacher ratios will be no more than 10 to 1. Children need individualized and quality attention to thrive and these requirements provide that.

Prekindergarten programs will consist of a 6-hour day. This requirement supports both children and working parents who need high quality programs for their children while they work.

Prekindergarten teachers will be required to have a bachelor's degree at the time they are employed, or obtain one within 6 years. Funding under my bill may also be used for professional development purposes by teachers.

States will not be able to divert designated funding for other early childhood programs into prekindergarten. We want prekindergarten to build upon and support other early childhood programs like Head Start and child care. We do not want prekindergarten to replace these programs in any way. All these programs are necessary and serve different purposes.

Prekindergarten programs will be accountable to a State monitoring plan that will appropriately measure individual program effectiveness.

Infant and toddler programs will receive a portion of the funding. These programs typically receive the lowest dollars of all early childhood programs, making it difficult for working parents, many of them single mothers, to find quality child care for the youngest of children.

A portion of funding will be used to create extended day and extended year programs. Working families struggle to afford high quality care for their children during after-school hours and the summer months—this provision will increase the availability of good options.

Finally, my bill supports the important role of parents in the education of their young children by encouraging parental involvement in programs and assisting families in getting the supportive services they may need. Children come in families and to truly help children, we have to involve and support their parents.

There is one additional component of my bill that I'd like to highlight. My bill ensures that prekindergarten providers will collaborate and coordinate with other early childhood providers so that prekindergarten programs can support and build upon existing programs and services for children. This is a very high priority for me. For example, Head Start has provided effective

and comprehensive early education to the most economically disadvantaged children for the past 40 years. And community-based childcare providers are absolutely vital to the well being of our children. In crafting my bill and establishing a new Federal funding source for State prekindergarten programs, I have zealously protected the importance of Federal support and funding for Head Start and childcare programs. All these programs are necessary for a system of early childhood education that truly serves children and families by providing families with multiple options, avoiding duplication of services, and giving children access to the services and support they need to get the best possible start in life.

I believe that investing in our children is our moral responsibility. But for anyone who needs additional reasons, decades of research on the life outcomes of children who have attended early education programs prove the wisdom of this investment.

A landmark study of the Perry Preschool Program in Michigan began in 1962. Children were randomly assigned to attend the preschool or not, and then tracked over many years to measure the long-term impact of high quality preschool. By age 27, the children excluded from the program were five times more likely to have been chronic law-breakers than those who attended the program. By age 40, those who did not attend the Perry Preschool program were more than twice as likely to be arrested for violent crimes. Those who did not attend the Perry Preschool Program were also more likely to abuse illegal drugs.

The research also confirms that high quality prekindergarten programs not only keep children out of trouble, they help children succeed academically. Children in the Perry Preschool Program were 31 percent more likely to graduate from high school than children who did not attend the program. Children who were not enrolled in the Perry Preschool Program were also twice as likely to be placed in special education classes.

Another long-term study comparing 989 children in the Chicago Child-Parent Center to 550 similar children who were not in the program showed that children who did not participate in the program were 70 percent more likely to be arrested for a violent crime by age 18. Children who attended the program were 23 percent more likely to graduate from high school.

So we know that high-quality early education is invaluable for children. They do better in school, they're less likely to repeat a grade or be held back, less likely to need remedial help or special education. And they are less likely to engage in delinquency, drug use and other dangerous behaviors. But the research shows much more.

It turns out that these investments in young children save us quite a bit of money. Specifically, for every dollar invested, high quality early education

programs save more than \$17 in other costs. That is what I call a smart investment. Many leading economists agree that funding high-quality pre-kindergarten is among the best investments government can make. An analysis by Arthur Rolnick, senior vice president and director of research at the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, showed that the return on the investment of the Perry Preschool Program was 16 percent after adjusting for inflation. Seventy-five percent of that return went to the public in the form of decreased special education expenditures, crime costs, and welfare payments.

To put this in perspective, the long-term average return on U.S. stocks is 7 percent after adjusting for inflation. Thus, while an initial investment of \$1,000 in the stock market is likely to return less than \$4,000 in 20 years, the same investment in a program like the Perry Preschool is likely to return more than \$19,000 in the same time period. William Gale and Isabel Sawhill of the Brookings Institution observe that investing in early childhood education provides government and society "with estimated rates of return that would make a venture capitalist envious."

With research as clear and compelling as this, I defy anyone to give me one good reason why we are not investing more—much more—in sound early education for our children.

I guess we shouldn't be surprised, though, that despite the evidence, this administration has gone in the opposite direction. Under this administration, cuts to early childhood programs have hurt hundreds of thousands of children and the numbers are only growing. Head Start has been cut 11 percent since 2002. The National Head Start Association calculates that by 2008 our country will have 30,399 fewer children in Head Start than in 2007—that figure includes nearly 1,100 children from Pennsylvania.

The President has also called for a freeze in funding for child care assistance—for the sixth year in a row. Currently, only 1 in 7 eligible children receives Federal childcare subsidies. Years of flat funding have already resulted in the loss of child care assistance for 150,000 children. By 2010, 300,000 more children are slated to lose out. In my own State, the current trajectory will mean the loss of \$14 million in childcare assistance by 2012.

This is, very simply, unacceptable. And it is profoundly wrong. And it is fiscally irresponsible.

I began my remarks this morning with the question, "How are the Children?" The current answer to that question is not acceptable.

It is my deep conviction that as elected public servants, we have a sacred responsibility to ensure that all children in this country have the opportunity to grow to responsible adulthood, the opportunity to realize their fullest potential, to live the lives they

were born to live. The Protect All Kids Act is a big step in that direction, and I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill. Everything we do in Congress has some impact—in one way or another and for good or for bad—upon the well being of our children. Our children are our future. With everything we do we must ask ourselves, "How are the children?" We cannot rest until the answer to this most fundamental of questions is: The children—all the children—are well.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is now closed.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM ACT OF 2007

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1348, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1348) to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid (for Kennedy/Specter) amendment No. 1150, in the nature of a substitute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, is recognized for up to 2 hours.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I thank the Chair for recognition and want to continue the discussion on the very important piece of legislation that is now before the Senate.

I do believe the immigration system is comprehensively broken. I have said for some time we need a comprehensive solution to it, to comprehensively reform it, but to reform it in a way that will actually work, that will do it with principles we can adhere to in the future, that will move us from a lawless system of immigration.

Most people may not know but 1.1 million people are arrested each year entering our country illegally. Think about the cost and personnel involved in processing that many people. It is a system that is not working. We know many people are getting by the border and not being apprehended.

It rightly causes the American people to question how serious we are in Congress when we say we want to do something about it. They believe we should do something about it. We say we want to do something about it, but eventually, as time goes along, for one reason or another, little ever seems to occur that actually works.

I have stated more than once we can pass a lot of legislation in this Senate dealing with immigration, but if you offer something that will actually work, to actually fix the problem, to actually be effective, we always have much wailing and crying and gnashing

of teeth, and usually those things do not become law.

Last year, I was very critical of the bill that was offered. I said it was fatally flawed. I said it should be withdrawn and urged my colleagues that if we drafted a bill for this session of Congress it should not be based on last year's fatally flawed bill but that we should start over and create a system that would create a genuine temporary worker program, not the flawed program that was there last year, that would move us toward a Canadian-based system where people all over the world could apply to our country, and they would be selected based on their merits and the skills and abilities they bring that would be valuable to our country.

I noted that we needed, of course, effective border enforcement as well as workplace enforcement, and we ought not to create a system that gives someone who enters our country illegally every single benefit we give to those who come to the country legally. The legal people do deserve to be treated in a different way than those who come illegally.

Now, I know as a matter of compassion and practicality we have to wrestle with the 12 million people here. I never doubted that. Nobody doubts that. How we deal with it, though, is a matter that will determine what policies we, as a nation, adhere to. It will send a signal to people all over the world that we are actually going to insist that we have a legal system of immigration and we intend to enforce it.

It is one thing to have a law, but if you are not prepared to enforce it and go through the process that is oftentimes painful to catch someone who violated the law and then have them deported—oftentimes that is a painful process—you either are going to do that or we might as well admit here we have no intention of enforcing any laws.

I do not think that is what we do. Almost every Senator has stated they want a lawful system of immigration, Republicans and Democrats. I do not think we have a problem. I would say yesterday and last week I had a very great concern that a plan was afoot to get cloture on the bill yesterday. The old bill, which I steadfastly believe is not an effective piece of legislation, would then be substituted by a new piece of legislation. That happened last night. It is approximately 300 pages of fine print and maybe 1,000 pages of the kind of legislative bill language we normally use here. It is one of the largest pieces of legislation to be introduced since I have been in the Senate. I think the Presiding Officer, Senator LANDRIEU, might remember some of the omnibus bills may have been that big, but I cannot remember a single piece of legislation since I have been in the Senate that would be 800 to 1,000 pages.

So the scheme or the plan was to try to move that through this week. I am